

**Michigan Water Resources Conservation Advisory Council**  
**April 3, 2009, Meeting Summary**

The Friday April 3, 2009, WRCAC Meeting was held in the Genesee Room #1230 of the Prael College Center Building more commonly known as the Mott College Library at the Mott Community College in Flint Michigan from 10 to 3.

Council members in attendance were Jon Allan, Sumedh Bahl, Dr. Bryan Burroughs, James Clift, Jon Coleman, Frank Ettawageshik, Michael Gregg, Scott Piggott, Frank Ruswick, Dr. Paul Seelbach, Richard Slevatz, Dr. Pat Soranno, Bob Walther, and Paul Zugger.

Absent members were Dr. Jo Latimore, Craig Hoffman, Mark Lemons, Peter Manning, Timothy Neumann, Michael Newman, and Samuel Wendling.

Guests present were Jim Cleland, Abby Eaton, Pat Fouchey, Fred Goldberg, Rita Jack, Tammy Newcomb, Jim Nicholas, Polly Synk, and Marc Smith.

**Welcome - Review minutes - Review agenda and Goals for the Day**

Scott Piggott welcomed everyone to the Library of the Mott Community College. Scott Piggott said on behalf of the Council he thanks the Michigan Potato Industry Commission for setting up this meeting.

Scott Piggott asked if everyone had a copy of the agenda and a copy of the Draft Summary of March 6 WRCAC Meeting.doc. He asked that everyone take a moment to review the Draft Summary of March 6 WRCAC Meeting.doc. The council approved the Draft Summary of March 6 WRCAC Meeting.doc. with suggested change be posted to the [www.michigan.gov/wrcac](http://www.michigan.gov/wrcac) webpage.

Everyone introduced themselves.

Scott Piggott reviewed the agenda. The morning session will be reviewing subcommittee work especially Tool report. The afternoon will have a presentation on potato growing, discuss a timeline for the August 9, 2009, Report along with new business and public comment.

**Sub-committee Reports                      Program Funding/Data Quality**

From 10:10 till 10:39 Subcommittee Chairman Paul Zugger outlined the issues the Program Funding/Data Quality Subcommittee would be addressing. This ad-hoc subcommittee was established at the March 2009 meeting and, in addition to the chairman, includes the following members: James Clift, Frank Ruswick and Abby Eaton.

At last month's meeting Frank Ruswick discussed the DEQ budget. In preparation for this month's meeting, Frank Ruswick developed a handout that presents staffing requirements for various program functions and the anticipated level of staffing that will be available for 2010. This was reviewed by the council. Paul Zugger asked whether the DEQ anticipated being able to fill the new staff positions listed in the second part of the handout. Frank Ruswick reported that filling some of these positions would be likely at some point, but this depends on how the budget situation will play out.

Paul Zugger asked Mike Gregg to report on the MDA situation. At the March meeting, Mike Gregg had reported that the MDA will be eliminating funding for the one FTE that has been dedicated to collecting water use data, primarily from agriculture users. Mike Gregg affirmed that this was going to happen. This work will need to be shifted over to the DEQ.

Paul Zugger asked the status of the on-line reporting capability, which could be instrumental in increasing the level of voluntary reporting. Frank Ruswick reported that the funding for this work has been made available to the Department of Information Technology (DIT), but the project has not

received a high priority there. Discussion followed regarding how to raise this to a higher priority with DIT. Frank Ruswick will review this and report back. There was discussion regarding seeking other funding sources, such as the Great Lakes Commission, and pursuing coordination of a basin-wide data base with other states.

Abbey Eaton discussed work MSU has been doing in helping to develop an on-line reporting system. Frank Ruswick reported that it is possible for outside entities such as MSU to provide assistance in developing information systems such as on-line reporting. But DIT would still need to be involved and would be the ultimate owner of the system.

### **Tool Evaluation**

Paul Seelbach said his discussion will focus on reviewing the *Evaluation of Accuracy and Operation of the Water Withdrawal Assessment Tool (Screening Tool) Report*. The report was first discussed at the March 6, WRCAC meeting. A revised version was distributed to all of the council members to review and comment as a homework assignment. The revisions / comments were incorporated by David Hamilton. This latest version was sent out yesterday – April 2. Scott Piggott asked if everyone had a copy of *Evaluation of Accuracy and Operation of the Water Withdrawal Assessment Tool (Screening Tool) Report*. The document name: *WRCAC\_draft\_final\_report\_DAH\_03\_25\_09.doc*.

Paul Seelbach said the report was restructured. The report now puts accuracy first, then operations, then phase in. With the report displayed on the screen, Paul Seelbach said there is an introductory paragraph, then an executive summary. We will look at the executive summary section last. From 10:30 till 12:50 the sections: Evaluation of Accuracy, Whether the tool works appropriately as a “screen” - Testing existing wells, Comparing screening tool response with DEQ site level review, and Potential Downstream Impacts were reviewed and discussed.

### **Lunch**

Boxed lunches that contained a sandwich, fruit, chips and a cookie along with pop and water was brought into the room compliments of the Michigan Potato Industry Commission.

### **Sub-committee Reports Con’t**

### **Tool Evaluation**

Paul Seelbach said now on the operational section of the report at the bottom of page 11 at 12:45. The discussion continued on till 1:29 covering the sections: Initial internet use of screening tool and feedback from online users, Improvements made to the screening tool, Conducting a series of workshops on use of the screening tool, Feedback from the workshops, Other outreach efforts, Implications of the phase-in provision, Conclusion, and Executive Summary.

The Council thanked the Test and Evaluation of Assessment Tool Subcommittee with a special thanks to Paul Seelbach said Dave Hamilton.

### **Educational Materials**

Jon Coleman distributed a handout titled *Report To Water Resources Conservation Advisory Council from the WRCAC Education Materials Subcommittee* to all present. From 1:29 till 1:54 the handout was reviewed and discussed – attachment 2.

Jon Coleman said the first conclusion the subcommittee came to is the Legislative Charge is very broad. The subcommittee feels there are many materials for ground water quality but not on sectors or use. Also need more educational materials on the Tool.

We should be proud of the number of people who we worked with.

Jon Coleman said the subcommittee spoke on who the educational material should be geared to. Two groups: Large water user group and water assessment and education committee. Jon Coleman said

the subcommittee spoke about the differences between the 2 committees. Water user groups can cover a large area. Watershed groups at watershed. Need to give specific information.

Jon Coleman said during the subcommittee's meeting some questions were raised. They are outlined in the report that was handed out. Jon Coleman asked for comments back.

The subcommittee would like to have a representative from DEQ and some large water use members. To make attending a meeting easier there will be conference call capabilities at all future meetings.

The next meeting will be April 27 at the Tri-County Regional Planning Commissions Office at 913 W Holmes Road Suite 201 in Lansing Michigan.

Jon Allan said there will be a large summit this fall that the subcommittee should be aware of. It is the Michigan Alliance for Environmental and Outdoor Education Environmental EDUCATION CONFERENCE on October 8-10, 2009 held at U of M Dearborn's Environmental Interpretive Center. Presentation proposals are due June 15. Conference information is available at <http://www.michiganenvironmentaled.org> )

Jon Coleman asked if we want to encourage water groups to form. Jim Cleland said it would be better to have one in place before needed. Dick Slevatz asked if the watershed group would be another process that a water user must go through before being authorized to withdraw water. Frank Ruswick said the watershed group is structured to facilitate long term planning and will not have a direct role in authorizing water uses. Frank Ruswick suggested that how water user groups and watershed planning groups form and operate should be monitored by the Council, since the DEQ will apparently not have sufficient funding to undertake its role in facilitating these groups.

### **Preventative Measures**

Bryan Burroughs said this subcommittee has not had any meetings due to scheduling conflicts.

### **Conservation**

Scott Piggott said thanks to all who commented on the *WRCAC Sub-Committee Report on Michigan/Compact Conservation & Efficiency Programs Water Resources Conservation Advisory Council March 6, 2009* report. The subcommittee is still working the report. Also looking at putting out a survey.

### **Impacts on Lakes**

Pat Soranno distributed a 2 sided handout. One side was title: *Summary from Dave Hamilton*. – Attachment 3.

Pat Soranno said slow progress. Still expect to take another 4 – 6 weeks to get classifications. Please look at the handout; the side that says: *the types of lakes and wetlands in relations to stream and GW connectivity*. This conceptual framework shows the two extremes to try to explain main tasks. Expect to see something like this in subcommittee's report.

### **Potato Production and Water Use**

From 2:06 till 2:30 Bob Walther gave information about the Michigan Potato Industry Commission and Michigan Potato Growers. Bob Walther said Michigan potatoes growers use about 45,000 acres of Michigan land. Potatoes rank about 10<sup>th</sup>. In last 15 – 20 years took over from Minnesota for Michigan being the #1 producer of potatoes for potato chips. Potatoes are best grown on sandy type soil for easier harvesting. The potato industry gets no subsidy from the government so potatoes are a non-subsidy crop.

About 90% of the potato crops in Michigan are irrigated. Growers in Michigan pump out of high capacity wells. Center pivot irrigation is used most. On a ½ mile by ½ mile piece of land which is about 160 acres can wet 145 acres. Bob Walther than gave some details on the cost of irrigation – pipes /

electricity. Probably over ½ of the potato growers under pump because of cost. Hoping rain comes. Bob Walther rotates with other farmers to be more efficient.

Jon Coleman asked about organic potatoes. Bob Walther said his farm doesn't do organic. There is a demand for organic.

Bob Walther said potato sales are high now. In economically tough times people stay home and eat chips instead of going to movies.

### **Establish Plan of Work for August 9, 2009 Report**

Scott Piggott said there is a lot of work into crafting a final report. From 2:30 to 2:40 a discussion was held on a timeframe for having the August 9, 2009, report ready.

Scott Piggott said at the July 10, 2009, meeting would like to have a final draft. At June 5, 2009, meeting would like to see the first draft. There are 7 different subcommittees. Have about 6 – 8 weeks to get drafts of reports ready.

Jim Nicholas said maybe give an executive summary on August 9. Jon Coleman suggested a template type report. James Clift said possibly at the May meeting could spend some time in subcommittees. Frank Ruswick suggested that in May each subcommittee submit an outline.

Scott Piggott said at the May 1, 2009 Meeting each subcommittee will submit an outline and will have breakout time. Frank Ruswick said in May will decide on type of report. Will get reports together through Pat Fouchey at [FoucheyP@Michigan.gov](mailto:FoucheyP@Michigan.gov).

Bryan Burroughs said another charge is to make recommendations: 4C in statute. Paul Seelbach agreed to roll Tool Assessment Subcommittee into The Tool Recommendation Subcommittee.

### **New Business and Public Comment**

Mike Gregg asked if there had been any legislative contact. James Clift said they are at break now. He will touch base with them once they are back.

Jim Nicholas said the President signed a bill for secure water act.

Paul Seelbach said he was just in Wisconsin. The meeting he attended focused on the ELOHA process and Michigan Model. Paul Seelbach said on the second day Ohio folks joined the meeting. They were also interested in our tool.

### **Next Meetings**

May 1, 2009, from 10:00 – 3:00 in the Wexford A Meeting Room at McGuire's Resort at 7880 Mackinaw Trail near Cadillac, Michigan hosted by Tim Neumann.

June 5, 2009, from 9:00 – 2:00 at the Drummond Island Resort & Conference Center at 33494 S Maxton Road on Drummond Island, Michigan hosted by Craig Hoffman.

**FTE ESTIMATES AND PRIORITIES  
IMPLEMENTATION OF PART 327 OF ACT 451  
WATER USE AND WATER WITHDRAWAL PROGRAM**

Beginning with the section on Permits, the order in which activities are laid out within this document reflect the priority given the tasks by the Water Bureau in administration of the Water Use and Water Withdrawal Program (WUWWP). Priority has been given to activities where the law requires the specified task be conducted. The two columns to the right reflect the FTEs the WB estimates is needed to accomplish the specified tasks (Req) and the FTEs currently dedicated to the activities (Ded).

<b>Supervisory and Program Support</b>	<b>Req</b>	<b>Ded</b>
Program / staff coordination in administration of WUWWP	1.0	0.5
Contract administration and support		

<b>Permits (Sec. 32723)</b>	<b>Req/Ded</b>	
Review of permit applications including evaluation of hydrologic and hydrogeologic information (30 day limit)	0.5	0.5
Compliance with public notification and public comment requirements		
Evaluation of conservation and preventative measures		
Issuance of permits (120 day limit from complete application)		

<b>Site Specific Reviews (Sec. 32706b and 32706c)</b>	<b>Req/Ded</b>	
WB coordination of site specific reviews with LWMD and DNR-Fisheries	1.5	1.5 <sup>1</sup>
Review of submitted data and/or hydrogeologic studies		
User notifications of DEQ decision affirming WWAT decision or zone reassignment		
Verification of flow estimates		
Potential processing of permit as Zone C and > 1 MGD or Zone D		
Accounting and addition of verified data to the WWAT		

<b>Petitions {(Sec. 32723 (12) and 32706a(7))}</b>	<b>Req/Ded</b>	
Handling of petition process pursuant to administrative procedures	0.25	0.00
Review of hydrogeologic, hydrologic and environmental impact		
Investigation of claims and recommend decision (6 month limit)		

<b>Coordination w/ PWSS Programs (SDWA - Sec. 4 and Sec. 17)</b>	<b>Req/Ded</b>	
Required evaluation of Community LQW's relative to ARI using WWAT	0.75	0.75
Evaluation of PWSS relative to permit criteria of Part 327		
Coordination of SDWA permits - public notification and comment		

<b>Water Use Reporting (Sec. 32707 and 32708)</b>	<b>Req/Ded</b>	
Mailing of water use reporting forms and invoices	1.0	0.75 <sup>2</sup>
Compiling and tracking of reported water use		
Updating of Water Use Reporting and GWIM databases		
Agricultural water use reporting - compiling, tracking		
Assist in development of on-line water use reporting system		



Accounting and addition of verified data to the WWAT		
--	--	--

Water Use/LQW Registrations (Sec. 32705, 32706)	Req/Ded	
Tracking of registrations	0.50	0.25
Accounting and addition of verified data to the WWAT		
Updating of Water Use Registrations and GWIM databases		
Assist in development of on-line water use registration system		
Review of WWAT determinations - verification of ESEFWCM self-certifications		

On-line Assessment Tool (Sec. 32706a)	Req/Ded	
WB support of WWAT - coordinate with LWMD and FD-DNR	0.50	0.50 <sup>1</sup>
Assist in data verification - registrations and water use reporting		
WWAT annual report to legislature		

Additional Responsibilities under the Compact		Req/Ded	
Annually report water use to Compact data base repository	0.50	0.25	
Develop and implement conservation and efficiency programs			
Monitor implementation of proposals approved under Compact			
Provide technical review of proposals (in state and out) subject to Compact			
Assist in conducting assessments of use, consumption and diversion			
Current Status of FTEs working on Implementation of Part 327		6.5 / 5.01 <sup>1</sup>	

The preceding activities are currently required by law in administration, development and implementation of the WUWWP. Staffing levels are insufficient to effectively accomplish the mandated tasks currently required. Subsequent activities were to be handled through the hiring of additional staff and the listing depicts the probable prioritization with continued staff deficiencies. No significant staff time is being dedicated to the activities identified below.

Water User Committees (Sec. 32725)	Req/Ded	
Required notifications of registrants, permit holders, local units government	0.5	0.0
DEQ investigation of adverse resource impact allegations		
Convene meeting of registrants and permit holders		
Negotiate agreements on water resource allocation		
Document and prepare orders for restriction of water use		

Notifications and Watershed Management (Sec. 32710)	Req/Ded	
E-mail notifications to interested parties	0.5	0.0
Assist in formation of water resource assessment and education committee		
Provide to the committee educational and other materials		

Compliance and Enforcement (Sec. 32713)	Req/Ded	
Investigate violations of section 32721 and 32723 (\$10,000/day)	0.5	0.0

Investigate all other violations of Part 327 (\$1,000/day)		
Support of civil suits for knowingly violation of Part 327		

<b>Water Conservation Measures (Sec. 32708a)</b>	<b>Req/Ded</b>	
Maintenance of generic water conservation measures	0.5	0.0
Review and oversight of sector submitted conservation measures		
Monitor implementation of conservation measures where required		

<b>Land and Water Management Division (Sec. 32706d et al.)</b>	<b>Req/Ded</b>	
Verification of flow estimates in site specific review and permit processes	1.5	0.0
Field verification of flow through measurements		
Assist in WWAT data verification and updates		
Development / implementation of stream flow data collection program		

**Current Estimate of FTEs for Full Implementation of Part 327**

**10.0**

<b>Current Allocations for Contract Services</b>	<b>CMI Amount</b>
WB contracting for development of on-line registration process and subsequent web site maintenance	\$75,000 <sup>3</sup>
WB contracting for maintenance of on-line assessment tool	\$75,000 <sup>3</sup>
WB contracting for development of on-line water use reporting process and subsequent web site maintenance	\$75,000 <sup>3</sup>
Contracting for water level and flow data collection	\$100,000 <sup>4</sup>
Total Annual Contractual Dedication for Implementation	\$325,000

1 - 1/2 FTE in LWMD assists in the site specific review process and works on WWAT

2 - An additional FTE is in MDA to handle water use reporting by Ag

3 - Annual disbursement to web site hosts (DIT or MSU)

4 - Annual disbursement to LWMD/U.S. Geological Survey

**Date: March 30, 2009**

---

**REPORT TO WATER RESOURCES CONSERVATION ADVISORY COUNCIL**  
**From the**  
**WRCAC EDUCATION MATERIALS SUBCOMMITTEE**

Date: March 25, 2009 (Wednesday)  
Time: 9:30 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.  
TCRPC  
913 W. Holmes Rd., Suite 201  
Lansing, MI 48910

---

**MEETING SUMMARY**

Members Present: Jo Latimore, MSU Department of Fisheries & Wildlife  
Tim Neumann, MI Rural Water Association  
Rita Jack, Sierra Club Michigan Chapter  
Ruth Kline- Robach, MSU  
Christine Spitzley, TCRPC  
Jon Coleman, TCRPC  
Grenetta Thomassey, Tip of the Mitt Watershed Council (Conference call participant)

Jon Coleman called the meeting to order at approximately 9:30 a.m.

- Reviewed the legislative charge to the Committee and the February 8<sup>th</sup> WRCAC status report to the Legislature (see attached Subcommittee portion of report).
  - Legislative charge was very broad, needs to be more focused.
  - General public information on groundwater already exists. Educational materials already available on groundwater quality but not much on groundwater quantity or use, especially by sector.
  - Need to focus more on increasing educational materials about the assessment tool. The WRCAC, Farm Bureau and MSUE are the only ones to date that have focused on education about the Water Assessment Tool.
  - Need to develop and provide materials to support both “Large Water User Groups” and “Water Resources Assessment and Education Committees”.
  - Also need to focus on educational materials on large water user sectors where appropriate (agriculture, golf, dewatering, lake augmentation, etc.)
  - Need to review status of Best Management Practices (BMPs) submitted by sectors as of March 31, 2009 in accordance with PA 182 of 2008.



- Reviewed Public Act 182 and 184 of 2008 (see attached).
  - PA 182 – Looked at requirement for Conservation Measures or BMPs
  - PA 184 – Looked at Water Resources Assessment and Education Committees and Water Users Committees.
    - Water Resources Assessment and Education Committees (can be a larger area, such as a watershed or multi-jurisdictional level)
    - Purpose:
      - Technical information on water use, capacity in vicinity
      - Education Materials
      - Recommendations
      - Long Term Planning
      - Conservation Measures
      - Drought Management
      - Other Water Use Topics
    - Large Water Users Committees (small sub-watershed areas)
      - Ad-Hoc Subcommittee on water resources, use and trends
      - If Water Resource Assessment and Education Committee is already formed this ad-hoc subcommittee may not be needed.
- Where multiple conservation, watershed or planning groups exist, who takes the lead?
- Could or should a Water Resources Assessment and Education Committee be formed before MDEQ notification?
- Need MDEQ representative on our Subcommittee.
- Need more large water use sectors represented on Subcommittee.

The next meeting is scheduled to be held on Monday, April 27, 2009 at 10:00 a.m. at the Tri-County Regional Planning Commission offices in Lansing. Meeting participation by conference call is an option.

April 2, 2009

WRCAC - Inlands lakes and wetlands subcommittee

**Summary' from Dave Hamilton:**

**Next steps in determining potential impact of groundwater pumping on lakes**

- 1) While the current WWAT is not designed to protect lakes, it indirectly provides some level of protection by establishing a water budget of allowable withdrawals within every watershed. An initial step is to use a CIS to screen lakes relative to the water budget.
- 2) Develop screening techniques to determine lakes that may be sensitive to pumping.
  - a) Use ratios of flow to volume or surface area.
  - b) Use ratio of lake surface area to watershed drainage area.
- 3) Investigate the feasibility of using the DNR Fisheries Division "Darcy map" (potential for groundwater recharge based on topography) together with alkalinity data to define what lakes are groundwater dominant.
- 4) Develop analytical tools to form the basis of an automated screen. This will probably be done after the metrics to measure an ARI are determined and work is underway to develop response curves.
- 5) Refine the category of lakes that "may" be sensitive to groundwater pumping, to those that are likely to experience an ARI if pumping exceeds certain amounts.

This is an iterative process; there will be overlap between some of the steps. The first three steps can be done relatively quickly (June timeframe). There is no "a priori" measure of what makes a lake sensitive to groundwater withdrawals. The answer will be developed as the analysis proceeds and the literature review is completed.

Draft-DAH 3/30/2009

# The types of lakes and wetlands in relation to stream and GW connectivity

